

The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XI

JANUARY, 1946

NUMBER 3

GESTURE THROUGH EMPATHY

SARA LOWREY

Baylor University

To gesture or not to gesture appears to be the question in some speech situations. The Texas Interscholastic League attempted to solve the problem by passing a rule against it in declamation contests.

A few years ago I was invited by a chairman to speak to a convention group of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech on the subject, "Gesture In Interpretative Reading." I was told that the matter was considered controversial. It seemed that some members of that group believed in gestures and others did not. I was eager to enter into such a discussion with my colleagues of the Southern Association. I wanted to hear what others had to say on the matter, and I had some ideas I wanted to express. But the war was on; it seemed advisable to postpone our discussion. I have not, however, postponed thinking about the matter. I've thought so much about it that I'm responding to the request for material made in the last issue of *The Southern Speech Journal*.

The debate among teachers of speech and the rule against gestures in declamation contests seem paradoxical when one considers the dictionary definition of gesture: "A motion of the body or limbs intended to express an idea or a passion, or to enforce or emphasize an argument, assertion or opinion."

It appears that the word connotes something not included in Webster's definition. It evidently suggests to some people a kind of bodily movement which is undesirable in the type of speech they wish to promote.

Surely we all agree that bodily movement offers an effective means of communication. Surely the stiffness which comes from inhibition is just as unnatural as the gestures which are put on in an effort to express.

The problem then is what type of bodily movement is desirable and how it may be motivated in order that it may be, or at least appear, natural.

I have observed three ways of thinking of gesture: (1), To show off. (2), To show the audience. (3), To experience reality.

As teachers of speech we have long since discarded exhibition in theory and we hope in practice. There, I think, is the root of the trouble regarding gesture in declamations and in interpretative reading. Antipathy for exhibitionism is surely the reason for the rule against gestures in declamation contests. The division among teachers of interpre-

tative reading is due, I believe, to the question in the minds of some as to whether gestures can be made without giving the appearance of exhibition.

The idea of showing the audience something by gesture seems to achieve no better results than that of showing off. Such motivation centers the thinking upon the gesture and hence results in self-conscious movements which call attention to themselves and appear exhibitory.

To experience reality through imagination seems to offer the solution to our problem. When one's thinking is so vivid that he experiences reality his concentration is upon the *cause* of bodily movement and not upon the gesture. Hence the gesture is, or appears, natural.

The word empathy is quite familiar to the modern teacher of speech. The principle of empathy is discussed in practically every speech textbook in current use. It is defined as the "feeling in" of "inner mimicry." It is interesting to note the nature of empathy. While the motivation is from within, the manifestation is often bold, free, even violent. Empathy is usually illustrated by the active participation of a crowd at a football game, who lean forward and seem almost literally to help in putting the ball over the goal. Such an illustration presents a clear and vivid picture to the average American whose joy in football is due largely to this active participation in the game. Psychologists and teachers of speech call this participation empathy.

Empathy in an audience presents convincing evidence of a speaker's effectiveness. Authors of speech textbooks are right to emphasize its importance in effective speaking. If members of an audience lean forward eagerly as a speaker describes a situation, if people sway from side to side as a reader interprets a lyric, or if the audience sits on the edge of the seats during a play empathetic responses give evidence of the effectiveness of the performance. The audience is not conscious of empathy. Their concentration is upon the reality of the ideas projected by the speaker, reader, or actor. This "feeling in" on the part of the audience is ample proof of audience concentration on the essence of the ideas. Empathy in the audience gives evidence of the speaker's success in communicating reality.

But why limit empathy to the experience of the audience? Is it not equally applicable to the speaker? Haven't we as speakers, readers or actors experienced an "inner mimicry" in response to an imaginative experience? Has not this "inner mimicry" resulted in free bodily movements which because of their reality brought about empathy in the audience? In the book, *Interpretative Reading*,¹ Miss Johnson and I define empathy first in terms of the reader (or speaker). We suggest it as a way of experiencing reality, a technique for the reader who through concentration on the imaginative experiences may so identify himself with it that inner mimicry will overflow into bodily actions or gestures. When one thus identifies himself with an image or with an image of an action he may be said to be empathizing. If the speaker

1. Sara Lowrey and Gertrude E. Johnson, *Interpretative Reading* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1942), pp. 59-60.

really
just a
empath
It res
Er
readers
expres
natura
action
Max
of exp
W

about
desire
on the
part o
they m
the to
audien
close o
experi
empat
be in
audienc
and na

The
the ca
likely
actions
one ca
must b
his ow

The
not go
justme
differ
to use

In
partly
a book
Activit
tive. I

A
and F
speake
audienc

2. Saret
13-31

really concentrates on an imaginative experience he will empathize just as one does when he is concentrating on an actual experience. This empathy on the part of the speaker is a way of experiencing reality. It results in movements which stimulate empathy in the audience.

Empathy can become a vital way of thinking for the speaker, reader or actor. This way of thinking eliminates conscious effort to express, effort to "make gestures" or to "do" it. Empathy is simply a natural way of responding dynamically to ideas, to objects and to actions. It is a cause of vital and natural expressiveness in the body. As Max Eastman says concerning bodily attitude in poetry; "It is a way of experiencing reality."

When gestures are a result of empathic response there is a totality about them which is coordinated and hence satisfies the audience's desire for naturalness. This type of motivation eliminates the tendency on the part of the speaker to "put on" a gesture or to express with a part of the body only. If arm and hand gestures result from empathy they may be considered as an overflow of activity which originates in the torso. This activity may be restrained until it is almost hidden; the audience may be aware only of the movement of the hand or arm but close observation will reveal that the whole body is coordinating in the experience. The chief difference between activity resulting from empathy and gestures made through conscious effort to express will be in the muscle tone of the whole body. From the viewpoint of the audience, however, it is likely to be the difference between affectation and naturalness.

The amount of activity must be at the discretion of the reader. If the *cause* seems to take precedence over the *actions* the gestures are likely to seem natural both to the reader and to the audience. Such actions give emphasis to the idea and in no wise detract from it. No one can tell an actor or a speaker how much action he may use. He must be guided by the total situation: the material, the occasion and his own freedom or limitations.

The total situation must also guide the reader. Certainly he should not go beyond the bounds of good taste but taste is a matter of adjustment to the total situation. One's manners at a football game should differ from one's decorum at a church service. It is well at all times to use restraint but enthusiasm and abandon are also important.

In interpretative reading the amount of bodily activity may depend partly upon whether the material is given from memory or read from a book, as to whether the book is on a stand or held in the hand. Activity may depend upon whether the material is dramatic or reflective. Individuals differ in their response and inclinations to gesture.

A few general principles may be set up as helpful guides. Sarett and Foster's² basic principles are as applicable to the reader as to the speaker. Effective reading results in part from free bodily action, yet audiences are influenced largely by signs of which they are unaware.

2. Sarett and Foster, *Basic Principles of Speech* (Houghton Mifflin Co., N. Y., 1936), pp. 13-31.

The most effective bodily activity is total bodily tonicity. Motor and organic imagery are effective ways of experiencing the reality of poetry or of prose. The best way to achieve natural and total bodily tonicity in reading is by empathic response to the imaginative experience. When the reader pictures the situation off stage, in the realm of the audience, or on the back wall of the auditorium and so concentrates on the reality that he empathizes with the imaginative experience he may achieve the type of bodily activity which emphasizes the idea and which holds the attention of the audience on the idea rather than on his actions. Empathy seems to be the answer to the question: To gesture or not to gesture.

SF
C
five
other
indi
inde
super
or th
neur
does
perm
the t
hard
mak
may
to le
say
the
tical
is cr
T
start
or sp
him
cripp
to h
freq
into
cripp
cripp
that
tell
palat
word
them
actua
subj
self
and
finds

*A p
ber

SPEECH CORRECTION IN THE CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM IN LOUISIANA: CRIPPLED IN THE TONGUE*

JEANETTE O. ANDERSON
Louisiana State University

"Crippled in the tongue"—that is the way a mother described her five-year-old son to me this fall. Jimmy can run, jump and play with other children. His body is not crippled. Psychometry, limited as it is, indicates no crippling condition affecting what is called intelligence; indeed, if we can rely upon our findings in this field, Jimmy is mentally superior. Yet, at five he does not talk as well as most youngsters two or three years of age. His tongue is not anatomically, physiologically or neurologically deficient insofar as physicians can determine. His tongue does not need clipping; it is not tied; the frenum is amply long to permit protrusion of the tongue and sweeping of the hard palate with the tongue tip. There is no significant pathology of Jimmy's lips, teeth, hard and soft palates, throat, larynx or ears. He just cannot seem to make them all work together to produce distinct speech. His speech may be likened to the halting, clumsy gait of the child who seems unable to learn to walk, the child who continues to creep; when this occurs, we say the child is crippled; indeed, our word "cripple" is derived from the Middle English and Anglo-Saxon forms of "creep." For all practical purposes, the child whose speech creeps when it should be walking is crippled—crippled in the tongue.

This crippling condition is as real a handicap to a child about to start school as are defective vision, impaired hearing, mental deficiency or spasticity. The speech defective child needs special teaching to help him overcome and/or compensate for his organically or functionally crippled organs as do other physically handicapped children. Failure to help him understand his problem and to improve his poor speech frequently result in physical or psychological trauma that are carried into adulthood and even throughout life. In addition to those children crippled in speech as Jimmy is, there are others who have general crippling conditions accompanied by a specific speech involvement that is more conspicuous than any other part of the picture. I need not tell you about the paralyzed, the stutterers, the cleft-lip and cleft-palate cases, the baby-talkers, the children who confuse sounds and words as they read and talk. You know these children. You teach them. You often wish there were a specialist to help them with their actual speech production so that you could devote your time to teaching subject matter and not to corrective speech drill. You have asked yourself and others, "Isn't there something to do about these poor speakers and oral readers?" You recognize the crippled state in which a human finds himself when he cannot communicate readily with other humans

*A paper presented before the Louisiana Speech Association meeting in Alexandria, November 29, 1945.

in the conventionalized system of phonetic symbols called speech. This handicap was recognized early: we recall the story of Demosthenes; Quintilian had a word of advice for parents and teachers of children slow in learning to talk; we remember the allusions to Moses' defective speech; we recollect that the mute came to Christ for help and that on several occasions, He caused them to speak. Since we humans have been able to speak, we have been jealous of our accomplishment and have regarded the loss or impairment of speech as disaster. In his little book, *This Simian World*, Clarence Day writes: "It is fair to judge peoples by the rights they will sacrifice most for. Super-cat-men would have been outraged had their right of personal combat been questioned. The simian submits with odd readiness to the loss of this privilege. What outrages him is to make him stop wagging his tongue. . . . He looks upon other creatures pityingly because they are dumb. If one of his own children is born dumb, he counts it a tragedy."

Are there, we question from time to time, enough of these dumb, these speech defective children to justify the expenditure of public concern and funds in their behalf? The White House Conference Survey report, published in 1931, and reports based on subsequent surveys made in communities from Oregon to New York and from Louisiana to Wisconsin indicate that from 2.8 per cent to 22.5 per cent of the children in unselected school populations are so defective in speech that they need special teaching if they are to achieve speech that is both intelligible and not unpleasantly conspicuous in manner of production. It is generally agreed that out of every ten children, at least one is probably seriously defective in speech.¹ These figures take into account only those children in school. We have no way of knowing how many children of school age are so seriously defective in speech that they are not enrolled in school.

Most defective speech conditions respond to treatment by the speech therapist working with other specialists. All defective speech tends to worsen and to precipitate other and more serious maladjustments when left unattended or when treated improperly. All impair or disable the child in certain functions essential to his liberty and his pursuit of happiness if not to life itself. All are crippling, as the word is defined in the dictionary to mean disabled or impaired, and all demand rehabilitation if the child is to become a useful, self-supporting citizen of the world. Crippled speech may exist in the absence of other crippling conditions or in conjunction with them. Alone or as one part of a syndrome, inadequate speech, speech that presents "an unusually conspicuous deviation in the speech pattern of an individual which is incapable of bringing about an adequate social response and which by the same token constitutes a maladjustment to his environment," is crippling and in need of rehabilitation.

1. Day, Clarence. *This Simian World*. Knopf, N. Y., 1936. pp. 22-23.
2. West, Robert; Kennedy, Lou; Carr, Anna. *The Rehabilitation of Speech*. Harper, N. Y., 1937. pp. xviii-xx.
3. O'Neill, James M., editor. *Foundations of Speech*. Prentice-Hall, N. Y., 1942. pp. 439-440.
4. Travis, Lee Edward, *Speech Pathology*. Appleton, N. Y., 1931. p. 35.

In many states, federal and state legislation providing for the special education of crippled children is interpreted to include defective speech as a crippling condition. So far, this is not true in Louisiana. Orleans Parish provides for the speech rehabilitation of its own handicapped children, but the rest of the State depends upon whatever speech corrective training may be given incidentally in the regular or special classroom. Defective speech has not yet been defined as a crippling condition, and funds set aside for special education are not being used for speech correction. In 1944 the legislature of the State of Louisiana passed House Bill No. 540 which, with the signature of the governor in July of that year, became Act. No. 163. Several sections are of particular significance.

Section 1 reads:

It is hereby declared to be the public policy of the State to develop, extend and improve services and facilities for the special education of crippled and physically handicapped children as herein provided; and to prevent, insofar as possible, the educational limitations resulting from physical disabilities. This policy is based upon economic considerations, as well as humanitarian, designed to create self-sustaining citizens.

Section 4 provides that:

The parish school boards of the State are hereby authorized, upon the approval of the State Department of Education, to establish and maintain special classes for the education of physically handicapped children between the ages of five (5) and twenty-one (21) years, who, because of being physically handicapped, require special types of training and facilities, if there are ten (10) or more handicapped children of any one type or types which may be properly taught together. This provision shall not apply to such physically handicapped children as are provided for, by other special classes or schools at the expense of the State.

Section 6 implies authorization of State and parish school officials to interpret the provisions of the Act:

The entire provisions of this Act shall be administered by the State Department of Education, with the approval of the State Board of Education, and on the parish level, by the parish school boards; and the State Board of Education shall promulgate such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

If, then, defective speech is defined as a crippling condition, we have at hand the beginnings of provision for the rehabilitation of children suffering from such disabilities, for, in the terms of the Act, the creation of self-sustaining citizens.

To implement this Act, the legislature has voted funds, \$20,000 in 1944 and \$25,000 in 1945. These sums apportioned among the sixty-

four parishes of Louisiana can go but a short way toward providing adequate special education for physically handicapped children. During the two years this legislation has been in effect, only sixteen parishes have requested and been allocated state funds. Any other special education carried on in and by the public schools has been financed locally.

This prolonged discussion of the definition of "crippling" and of legislation providing for special education is given as background for the narration of our experience in Baton Rouge where last year a special class for crippled children was organized. Children suffering from cerebral palsy, epilepsy, amyotonia and undiagnosed conditions interfering with normal human behavior were enrolled. Most of these children have been of normal or dull normal intelligence. Over fifty per cent of them have been so seriously defective in speech that they could not be understood; or, if they could, their manner of speech production and/or its accompanying mannerisms drew adverse attention to them whenever they talked or attempted to talk. The teacher of the group, who is also a registered nurse, the supervisor of elementary education in the parish and a specialist in speech pathology and correction called in to examine the children all agree that defective speech is for at least twenty-five per cent of the entire group the most acute crippling condition obtaining. These children were most handicapped in learning, not by inability to use their hands, minds or feet, but by inability to talk so they can be understood. The classroom teacher found herself hindered, by lack of time and special training, in dealing with these speech problems. She consulted her supervisor who, in turn, made arrangements with the parish school board to provide speech corrective training for these children. Three mornings each week a graduate student in speech correction at Louisiana State University goes to the crippled children's classroom to supervise speech drill periods. All work is under the immediate supervision of the director of the LSU Speech Clinic.

If this experiment in the treatment of speech disorder as a primary crippling condition proves helpful in the teaching of this special class, it may be that defective speech can be classified and treated throughout the State as the crippling condition it is. "Crippled in the tongue" is as serious a state as that of children crippled in the arms or legs or brain. Let us recognize this fact not only in our own thinking but work to make others cognizant of it so that we may unite to do something about it.

An eminent mathematician once presented a paper on a difficult and stratospheric matter at a professional meeting. As he completed his reading, he tossed his paper onto a desk and said, "Well, gentlemen, there it is. It's *pure* science. Pray God it may never be useful!"

Speech pathology and rehabilitation, dealing with human materials and borrowing from many fields, is essentially an impure science. When one of us engaged in our impure scientific pursuits unmearths a fact or a theory or makes a beginning, he must, perchance, say, "Well, ladies and gentlemen, there it is. Pray God it may be useful."

THE MASCULINE REPERTOIRE OF CHARLOTTE CUSHMAN

DOROTHY E. COATS

*Beaumont Senior High School
Beaumont, Texas*

No other woman of the nineteenth century was as well known, at least in America, as Charlotte Cushman. During her forty years of professional life, she played to millions of people. Henry Clapp believed that she was "the only actress native to our soil to whom the adjective *great* [could] . . . be fitly applied."¹

The name *Cushman* itself means cross-bearer, and during the Crusades the man worthy of carrying the standard was given this name. Charlotte Cushman was truly the cross-bearer for American actresses. She was without doubt a daring, independent woman who was not satisfied with an ordinary stage career—a very degrading profession for the descendant of a long line of Puritans—but invaded man's "rightful" domain by portraying male characters.

Charlotte Cushman was no theatrical beauty for her "face [was] plain to ugliness, with a protruding chin, a nose like Macready's and a raw-boned masculine figure that would have been scarcely acceptable in a male."² However, this lack of feminine beauty had its compensation in the portrayal of masculine roles.

Probably her first acquaintance with male attire was the day she jumped from the wharf and failed to make a safe landing on a loading vessel. Soaked to the skin, she went to her father's office, where she dressed in a pair of dry overalls and a large jacket. Thus attired, she departed for home. There she found her mother not so much concerned with her danger as displeased at the escapade and mannish clothing. Thus for the first time she wore male dress, which she was to don so frequently during her stage career. Then, as later, there were those who did not like to see her "wear breeches."

While still "un enfant terrible", she made her first stage debut in the large attic of her mother's home where she portrayed the lover, Selim, in the operetta, *Bluebeard*. She played to an audience consisting of her mother and a few of the neighbors.

In school she was not recognized for her interpretative ability until she read a scene in which Brutus speaks from the tragedy *Brutus*. It is interesting to note that these early character portrayals were masculine.

During the nineteenth century, especially in Boston, children rarely attended the theatre. Charlotte, however, was permitted to go with her Uncle Augustus Babbitt, a seafaring man, who was a stockholder in the Tremont Theatre. There she saw Macready, Cooper and Mrs.

1. Henry Austin Clapp, *Reminiscences of a Dramatic Critic* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company; The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1902) p. 82.

2. H. Barton Baker, *The London Stage*, 2 vols. (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1889) p. 164.

Powell.³ It is likely that they stimulated and influenced Charlotte to seek a career. She first turned to music and studied voice for two years in Boston. However, when her musical career proved unsuccessful, she turned her attention toward the stage.

Probably her first professional masculine portrayal was the character Patrick in the *Poor Soldier*, a popular operatic farce. On September 17, 1836, she enacted this character at the Bowery Theatre. The following month at the Park she played Patrick and Gates Darby. It was during this 1836-37 season that she began her real theatrical training in Albany at the Pearl Street Theatre. While there, she portrayed the following male characters: Count Belino in *The Devil's Bridge*; Henry in *Speed the Plough*; Jack Horner in *Greville Cross*; Alvedson* in *The Two Galley Slaves*; George Fairman in *The Liberty Tree, or Boston Boys in 1773*; Henry Germain in *The Hut of the Red Mountain*; Romeo in *Romeo and Juliet*. Thus she announced early her predilection for male roles. Apparently there was nothing spectacular about these performances, for they went unmentioned by the critics of the period. However, at her Pearl Street farewell benefit on April 1, 1837, she played Romeo to enthusiastic applause.⁴

She then left Albany and went to New York. At the Old National Theatre beginning on April 22 or 23 (Ireland gives both dates), she again enacted Romeo, Patrick, and Count Belino. During this engagement she also portrayed Tom Tug in *The Waterman*. There were no available theatrical reviews about these portrayals.

Going to Boston, in June, she portrayed Henry in *Speed the Plough*. William Clapp reported that during this engagement Miss Cushman "gave the earliest taste of that dramatic spirit, which she [later] . . . cultivated to so much advantage."⁵

Upon her return to New York she began her three year Park Theatre engagement which probably lasted from September, 1837 to June, 1840. Ireland reported that she made her first appearance at the Park as Patrick in the *Poor Soldier* on August 26, 1837. During this period she worked and studied intensively. As the leading stock-actress, she had to play everything regardless of choice. Thus she often had to assume male characters. In this stern apprenticeship, where much of the work was drudgery, she learned the details of her art. At first she was not considered a suitable substitute for Mrs. Hilson and Mrs. Richardson, her predecessors; nevertheless, through perseverance and indomitable energy she was finally recognized by even the most fastidious. Ireland contended that even though she was fond of playing the parts of mischievous boys, her character portrayal of Aladdin was incomparable with that of Mrs. Barnes or Mrs. Skerrett and her

3. Emma Stebbins, *Charlotte Cushman: Her Letters and Memories of Her Life* (Boston: Houghton, Osgood and Company, The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1878) p. 16.

*It is not positive that the names marked with an asterisk are male characters.

4. H. P. Phelps, *Players of a Century* (Albany: Joseph McDonough, 1880) p. 240.

5. W. W. Clapp, Jr., *A Record of The Boston Stage* (Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe and Company, 1853) p. 349.

Cherubino was incomparable to that of Mrs. Hilson or Clara Fisher.*

While at the Park, Miss Cushman portrayed many minor roles which were either not worthy of mention or the critics neglected to review. The following list gives some of these characters: John Rolf in *Pocahontas*; Zamine* in *The Cataract of the Ganges*; Eustace* in *Woman's Wit*; Marquise* in *The Ladder of Love*; Gossamer Gadfly and Edwin Vere Gadfly in *The Twin Brothers*; Carlos in *Velasco*; Paul in *Pet of the Petticoats*; Peter in *Peter Wilkins*; Theodore* in *Lafitte*; Tom Noddy in *Tom Noddy's Secret*; Alphonso in *Der Freischutz*; Bob in *Tom and Jerry*; Fitzherbert Fitzhenry in *The Married Rake*.

There is some discrepancy in the accounts of Miss Cushman's first portrayal of Claude Melnotte in the *Lady of Lyons*. Ireland reported that she first enacted the character for her benefit performance on June 26, 1838. According to Odell, she portrayed the role on June 28, 1838, and repeated the performance on August 4th for Peter Riching's benefit. On the other hand, Matthews and Hutton maintained that she first assumed the role in 1850 at the Old Broadway in England, where she drew crowded houses and the public seemed to enjoy "the earnest and truthful manner in which she played the familiar character."**

On June 8, 1839, Charlotte's sister, Susan, made her debut in the *Genoese*. In order to lend support and encouragement, Charlotte played the lover. Thus they created an incomparable sister team. Ireland maintained that Charlotte undertook Montaldo "with great satisfaction—to herself." The sisters again appeared together on July 16, 1839, when Charlotte enacted Claude Melnotte to Susan's Pauline.

After leaving the Park Theatre she and her sister played in Philadelphia, where Charlotte portrayed Smike in *Nicholas Nickleby*. A better interpreter of this character was Mr. Henry Knight who had previously played it. Miss Cushman, if not equally successful, proved that she possessed powers of great versatility, a valuable quality to an actress.

She opened the season at the Park Theatre on August 30, 1841. Her portrayal of Oberon in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, however, went unobserved by the critics. It was during this season of 1841-42 that she and her sister "played together at the Park upwards of ninety nights."*** Advertisements in *The New York Herald* stated that on November 25, and December 3, Miss Cushman portrayed Thalaba* in *Thalaba, The Destroyer*. For this portrayal, no critical review was found.

On September 22, 1842, she announced her direction of the American Theatre on Walnut Street in Philadelphia. Here, in October, she first met and acted with George Vandenhoff who resented her for unsexing herself and believed such perversions should be prevented by

6. Joseph Ireland, *Records of the New York Stage*, Vol II (Philadelphia: Henry Carey Baird, 1855) pp. 161, 163.

7. Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton, eds., *Actors and Actresses*, Vol IV (New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886) p. 149.

8. Ireland, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

9. Clara Erskine Clement, *Charlotte Cushman* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1882) p. 21.

law. Nevertheless, he lent her a costume and gave her fencing hints so that she might portray Romeo. To Vandenhoff, the only scene worth mentioning in her hybrid performance was the killing of Tybalt and Paris. This she executed in effective masculine style. Eaton reported that this was "her first perpetration of that famous theatrical outrage."¹⁰ Ireland gives a much earlier date for her first performance of Romeo. During this period she also played Eloi* in *Forest of Bondy*. While manager of the Walnut Street Theatre, she assumed many female roles but few masculine characters. This is a possible reason why she was not a successful manager. Wemyss contended that "even the popularity of her name could not command success in such an undertaking."¹¹

When Macready visited this country in 1843, he requested that Miss Cushman be brought from Philadelphia to support him at the Park. With Macready she played no masculine roles. He took an interest in her and encouraged her to go to England.

Finally on February 14, 1845, she made her debut, which the London audience received with an enthusiastic ovation. Not since the days of Edmund Kean had such a memorable debut been made in an English Theatre.¹²

So great was her success that she sent for her family and placed them in a cottage at Bayswater. While there, she and Susan studied *Romeo and Juliet*, which they performed at Southampton before taking it to London. It was on December 29, 1845, that these American Indians, so called by London critics, discarded the Garrick flummery and appeared at the Haymarket in the original Shakespearean text of *Romeo and Juliet*. This was certainly no rash attempt by Charlotte, whose entire performance expressed masculine forcefulness. Even at the peak of his career, Charles Kemble as Romeo never moved an audience more fervently nor portrayed this character more authentically. Charlotte was now considered "the greatest female actress . . . since the days of Miss O'Neill."¹³ Undoubtedly, Charlotte's Romeo was a great success. The *Globe* reported:

Her scene at the balcony was very effective, and her voice was charmingly softened in accordance with the music of this most lovely of all love scenes. The scene in which Tybalt was slain was likewise good. The scene in which Romeo learns the sentence of his banishment, . . . was tremendously applauded, but it was too womanish, too lachrymose—the tears took from the intensity of passion. Miss Cushman was very happy in the soliloquy, "I do remember an apothecary," and the last scene at the tomb demanded high praise for its exquisite pathos, and threw any previous deficiencies into the shade.¹⁴

10. Walter Prichard Eaton, *The Actor's Heritage* (Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press) p. 107.
11. Francis Courtney Wemyss, *Twenty-Six Years of The Life of An Actor and Manager*, Vol. II (New York: Burgess, Stringer and Company, 1847) p. 336.
12. William Winter, *The Wallet of Time*, Vol. II (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1913) p. 616.
13. *The Standard*, London (December 30, 1845).
14. *The Globe*, London (December 30, 1845).

The sisters played this tragedy for eighty non-consecutive nights. They gave the last performance on July 11, 1846. It was probably during this engagement that Sidney Smith, cleverly commenting on the masculinity of Charlotte and the femininity of Susan, said, ". . . the least Charlotte . . . [can] do . . . [is] marry her sister."¹⁵ During this period Charlotte also portrayed Ion, but the character did not attract the attention of the critics.

Not until the fall of 1849, when she returned to America, was there again any mention of Miss Cushman's masculine repertoire. It was then that Mr. William T. W. Ball saw her enact Ion. He, like Vandenhoff, objected to her unsexing herself.

During her American season of 1850-51, her masculine roles were intermittent with no critical reviews. Undoubtedly, they were inferior to her female characters. She played Romeo at the Astor Place Opera House in May and at the Broadway in October. While at the latter theatre, she also portrayed Claude Melnotte. Again, in June, 1851, at the Broadway and in September and October, at Brougham's Lyceum, she enacted this character.

In November at Brougham's Lyceum, she portrayed Hamlet for the first time. Of all the mongrel Hamlets, Charlotte was the most daring and successful. Although she exerted and exhausted herself more in this character portrayal than in any other, the effort was not meritorious. There were only a few times when she portrayed Hamlet, and even though she received intense pleasure from the character, she played it with no striking effect. For her Boston performance of Hamlet, Edwin Booth lent her his costume which was most likely a tight fit. As Hamlet, she was little more than a curiosity.

While playing Romeo at the National in Boston, Miss Cushman proved that she was as gallant as any gentleman. In one of the impassioned love scenes, a spectator, giving vent to an obviously artificial sneeze, distracted the attention of the audience. Whereupon Miss Cushman graciously led her Juliet off the stage, returned and firmly demanded that the individual be evicted or she herself would personally throw him out the door. After the removal of the "sneezer," the audience rose and gave three cheers for the young Montague.

During the 1851-52 season, she played Romeo at the National, the Broadway, and in Washington, D. C.

The first time she bade farewell to her devotees was on May 15, 1852, at the Old Broadway Theatre. She retired almost as many times as she crossed the ocean—sixteen. Quipped Ireland, "She bade farewell according to the bills only."¹⁶ From this time until her death, she swayed between retirement and the theatre.

Miss Cushman as Romeo was again successful in 1855 at the Haymarket in London. By 1857 her personation of Romeo was world-renowned. The American public heartily welcomed "Our Charlotte" on September 30th of that year, when she played her famous role at

15. R. G. White, "Charlotte Cushman." *The Nation* (November 12, 1874) p. 314.

16. Ireland, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 594.

Burton's New Theatre. So great was the ovation that she repeated the performance.

It is interesting to note that on Friday, November 13, 1857, she portrayed Cardinal Wolsey in *Henry VIII* for the first time. Never before had a lady dared attempt such a difficult role. She was praised for her forceful and skillful impersonation, but by this time it was the fashion to applaud everything she did. Her characterization probably made no extraordinary impression for the critics of the period and her biographers seldom mention it. William Winter preferred her Cardinal Wolsey for abnegation of sex rather than her Hamlet.

On June 22, 1858, at Niblo's Garden, Miss Cushman again encouraged a young lady in her debut by playing opposite her. This time it was the charming Mary Devlin who acted Juliet to Charlotte's Romeo.

" . . . the foremost of living actresses"¹⁷ did not again portray a masculine character until November 1, 2, 3, 1860, at the Winter Garden Theatre, where an enthusiastic audience zealously received her Cardinal Wolsey. This arduous character was never a favorite of hers. However, in the third act, no other actor or actress could equal her as the Cardinal falling from greatness. It was in this scene that she "made old playgoers recall the times of Cooke, Kean and Macready."¹⁸ By special request, she enacted this role again on November 22.

Portraying Romeo, an ever favorite character, on November 8, she played to an overflowing house. Her performance seemed to be just as energetic and authentic as it had been during her rise to fame at the Park. The demand for this character portrayal was so great that she played Romeo through November 15. At this time audiences believed that no one could play the part but Miss Cushman. As Romeo, she received one hearty ovation after another. In December, staid Bostonian audiences enthusiastically received her Romeo at the Academy of Music. Since this character gave her an opportunity to express many different emotions and to fight a real duel, she preferred it to all the others.

Her tall gaunt figure and homely features were certainly no requisites for an actress, but the flexibility of her facial expression registered every passing emotion. Throughout her life she maintained an almost masculine virility which she strove neither to conceal nor diminish.

Her voice did not have a pleasing quality; rather, it was husky, hard, and aspirate—suggesting anything but the soft sex. Her voice did possess great range. As if summarizing the conflicting opinions of the critics, Mary Anderson described Miss Cushman's voice as being "too high for a man's, [and] too low for a woman's."¹⁹ This epicene vocal quality was probably an important factor in her masculine character portrayals. According to Murdoch, her articulation and enunciation

17. *The New York Times* (October 2, 1860).

18. *The New York Times* (November 2, 1860).

19. Mary Anderson (Mme. DE [sic] Navarro), *A Few Memories* (London: Osgood, McIlvaine & Co., 1898) p. 39.

was
Mac

V
deve
was
dition
influ
creat
busin
Murd
pract
mate
lotte

A
the b

fo
a
ha
of
ac
th
m
na
an
be

M
to tak
her a
very
strength

Th
precur
Heral
ficial
observ
in *Lla*
Cushn
Romeo
than h
Hutto

20. Jame

21. *Ibid*.

22. Hen

23. Geor

24. Steb

25. Matt

was not clear or remarkable, for in this she imitated Barton as well as Macready.²⁰

While employed as "a walking lady" at the Park, she began to develop a style of acting. During this period the majestic Kemble style was the vogue; consequently, she adopted many of the artificial traditional stage devices. Macready, too, with his art-methods had a strong influence on her characterization. However, with her native energy and creative force, she rose through the muck and mire of affected stage business and became the actor's forerunner in the school of naturalism. Murdoch described her as being intensely matter-of-act and "definitely practical, . . . hence her perfect identity with what may be termed the materialism of Lady Macbeth."²¹ Thus did Murdoch designate Charlotte Cushman as an exponent of the naturalistic school.

An incident which Henry Irving enjoyed relating also substantiates the belief that Miss Cushman belonged to this school.

I remember that when she played Meg Merrilies I was cast for Henry Bertram . . . It was my duty to give Meg Merrilies a piece of money, and I did it after the traditional fashion by handing her a large purse full of coin of the realm, in the shape of broken crockery, which was generally used in financial transactions on the stage . . . But after the play Miss Cushman, in the course of some kindly advice, said to me: "Instead of giving me that purse don't you think it would have been much more natural if you had taken a number of coins from your pockets, and given me the smallest? That is the way one gives alms to a beggar, and it would have added to the realism of the scene."²²

Miss Cushman insisted on adhering to the true facts and refused to take any liberties with the author's script. Ferris contended that her art went beyond the domain of experiment, for she, like a sculptor, very carefully studied the character before she gave it real life and strength.²³ Again there is a tendency toward naturalism.

There were other critics who verified the belief that she was a precursor of naturalism. When she made her debut in London, the *Herald* commented that she did not rant and that she was seldom artificial in her interpretation. A reporter in the London *Times* also observed that she rendered with absolute truth Romeo's temperament. In *Lloyd's Weekly Messenger*, another reviewer commented that Miss Cushman did not attempt a forced or elaborate interpretation of Romeo,²⁴ therefore, it is logical to believe that she was more natural than her contemporaries in her interpretation of the character. Laurence Hutton not only mentioned her naturalness in portraying Romeo²⁵ but

20. James E. Murdoch, *The Stage* (Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart & Co., 1880) p. 238.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 240.

22. Henry Irving, "The Actor and His Art," *New York Tribune*, March 31, 1885, p. 2.

23. George T. Ferris, "Charlotte Cushman," *Appleton's Journal*, March 21, 1874, p. 358.

24. Stebbins, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 60, 61.

25. Matthews and Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

also praised her truthful interpretation of Claude Melnotte.²⁶ When James Sheridan Knowles commented on Charlotte Cushman's Romeo in the scene with the Friar, he said that the passion was not simulated but real, obviously real.²⁷ Here again a critic verifies the belief that Miss Cushman was a naturalist. Stebbins also asserted that she was a splendid example of the natural school of acting which she preferred to the conventional.²⁸

Charlotte Cushman with her lack of feminine beauty successfully dared to give masculine portrayals which in other women would have seemed gross exaggerations. Her male characters were less incongruous than those portrayed by any other woman. An important factor in assuming these male roles was her masculinity in physical features, which strikingly resembled Macready's. It is probable that her lack of feminine beauty prompted her purposely to assume male roles and characters of a masculine nature.

It was most unusual that from a long line of strait-laced Puritans who lived in conservative Boston, there emerged, not without a difficult struggle, the first American-bred actress to be proclaimed a genius in both America and Europe.

In her younger days she was extremely versatile. After her London recognition, however, she limited her characters to a few classical ones and enjoyed her renown as a "star" of the stage.

Since Miss Cushman was an exponent of the school of naturalism, she was a little ahead of her time. Each role that she depicted was true to life. By carefully and intelligently studying character details, she made the portrayals seem natural. Her characterization of Romeo was so realistic that one young lady considered Miss Cushman a very dangerous young man.²⁹ As late as November 15, 1860, "our own Charlotte" continued to be the only living Romeo. Her other major roles, Cardinal Wolsey, Hamlet, and Claude Melnotte, were probably average renditions since they were seldom mentioned by the critics.

There are probably two reasons for the noticeable absence of masculine roles during Miss Cushman's declining years. First, in 1861 she retired to Rome where she basked in the glory of previous performances; second, she was afflicted with an incurable disease which gradually sapped her strength. Therefore, she probably realized the inadvisability of assuming male roles, which demanded such vigorous action.

William Winter's prophecy, that the American people would never permit her name to drift from their remembrance and that the name would always appear on the annals of honorable renown, was realized in 1915 when the Hall of Fame recognized her.

-
26. Mary Caroline Crawford, *The Romance of the American Theatre* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1925) p. 344.
 27. Edward Robins, *Twelve Great Actresses* (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1900) p. 366.
 28. Stebbins, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
 29. W. T. Price, *A Life of Charlotte Cushman* (New York; Chicago; Washington; Paris: Brentano's, no date) p. 143.

It is notoriously difficult to write about acting, for the critics are subjective in their reviews. Consequently, it is highly improbable that we secure a true picture of any great actor, whose work dies with him. Even though Charlotte Cushman was the greatest American actress^w of the nineteenth century, it is impossible for a changing public to keep alive the interpretations of a deceased artist whose work, by its very nature, is ephemeral.

30. *The New York Times* (October 2, 1860).

"I HATE POETRY"

AGNES CURREN HAMM

*Mount Mary College
Milwaukee, Wis.*

Did you skip the poetry in your books when you were a child? Most children do. The moment they see the poetic form they turn the page to the story in prose. They don't even bother to read the title of the poem. These are the very young children who say they don't like it. These are the same children who later become the high school and college students who say "I hate poetry," thus placing an almost insurmountable obstacle between themselves and the whole magic world of poetry.

This deplorable condition should not be remedied—it should never be allowed to exist. And if children are taught to appreciate poetry through choral speaking it will not exist. But this appreciation must be started as early as possible. In schools where choral speaking is being properly taught children in kindergarten are introduced to poetry in its most elementary form, the jingle, and they love it. The teacher tells about the story in the jingle, the pictures, the sounds, the rhyme words. And the children talk about it, too. They say what they like about it, what it reminds them of, and anything at all that will make it live for them. The teacher repeats the jingle several times, and then invites the children to say it with her as soon as they know a line or even a phrase. One little voice is heard, then two or three more, and very soon the whole class is saying it without any hesitancy, and, what is more important, they are liking it!

The same procedure is used in the first grade. Very simple little poems are read and discussed and even illustrated. Poems and jingles are understood and easily handled by first graders. Poems are fun. A few words about the author are given, just one or two interesting facts, just enough to make the children aware of the poet. In this simple way the teacher can begin to create an interest not only in the poetry but in those who write it. In all of this, of course, the teacher is of first importance. She must present the right material, she must be able to read it well, handling the rhythm properly and using the appropriate tempo; and she, too, must think they are fun. She must love and understand poetry because that is what she is trying to teach the children to do.

In this way, during the first years of school, the child begins to like poetry even before he knows what the printed form is like. And, as a result of this choral method of interpretation, he will look through his *Reader* searching for the poems rather than skipping them.

Why is choral speaking so enjoyable? First of all, because it is group work. Children like to do things together. That is, most of them do, and those who do not soon discover the joy of cooperation. The timid child is one of the happiest in the group because he finds release here, and he experiences pleasure in a type of work that he would never

have the courage to do alone. Even the exhibitionist is happy when he begins to understand that there is pleasure in doing things with others.

Poetry, like all art, will be enjoyed if it is understood. Choral speaking teaches children to understand it.

As a method of speech training choral speaking ought to be welcomed by the teacher. The laborious task of correcting diction becomes easier when we do it in a group with jingles and nonsense verse. Distinct "medial t's" and "final consonants" take on a much more interesting aspect.

Tone color and voice quality develop almost without effort. An occurrence in a Milwaukee school room will illustrate this better than anything I can say. A teacher was working with second graders who were interpreting a little poem about a cat. When they finished the teacher was not satisfied, and she said: "I don't think you did that very well. I wonder if anyone can tell me why?" A little boy held up his hand: "I know, Miss B. We sounded like an elephant instead of a cat." "What do you mean, Jimmy?" "Well, our voices were loud and heavy and slow—like an elephant." "How did you want them to sound?" "Sort of soft and quiet—like a cat." There it was, the very essence of an understanding of tone quality as a response to meaning. The children tried the poem again; Jimmy had taught them plenty. The poem was "soft and quiet—like a cat."

All English teachers in high school should find that the students come to them with a better background if they have had choral speaking in the grades. A reservoir of poetry should be theirs, poetry which they have enjoyed and absorbed completely and consequently should remember always. And they should have some acquaintance with the men and women who wrote the poetry, for such knowledge is background for their choral speaking.

What a change this would be from the situation that now exists in many high schools! "I hate poetry!" Why? Don't they understand it? Or were they made to memorize it mechanically with little or no attention to meaning? Or were they made to memorize so many lines after school for punishment? No wonder they hate it!

More of our leading educators should visit schools where choral speaking is being properly taught and see for themselves what it is doing for poetry. Where teachers have been trained for the work it is doing more than any other method to stimulate an appreciation for poetry.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDNA WEST

RADIO DRAMA IN ACTION, by Erik Barnouw, Ed. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1945. College edition \$2.25, trade \$3.00.

This collection of twenty-five radio scripts is representative of radio's best efforts in the field of public service programs employing the dramatic technique. The work of some of the best known writers such as Norman Corwin, Stephen Vincent Benet and Arch Oboler will be found in this volume, together with scripts whose authors are less well known but often equally interesting. Notes by the editor preceding each script provide biographical material about the authors and thought-provoking comments on the writing techniques employed.

The scripts included in this collection are a departure from the pat formulas commonly used on commercial programs. They are bold experiments consciously exploiting the advantages of the medium; they are pure radio, in that they could not be performed in any other medium.

Viewed from the standpoint of the producer, and assuming that broadcast rights could be secured, only a small number of these scripts would be suitable for production. Of current interest at the time they were first produced, they are now in the "awkward age," where they have neither timely nor historical interest. However, the book was obviously not compiled with production purposes in mind, but rather to provide illustrative material for those engaged in preparing scripts for public service programs. As such, the book fulfills its purpose admirably.

With the advent of frequency modulation and the renewed interest in educational radio manifested by so many educational agencies, this book should enjoy a wide circulation. Mr. Barnouw is to be congratulated on his recognition of the need for this type of material, and for his careful selection of model scripts.

NORA LANDMARK
Radio Program Director
Louisiana State University

SPEECH, by Andrew T. Weaver and Gladys L. Borchers. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945; 515 pp.

This is an entirely new book based upon the authors' *New Better Speech*. The text is organized around the four goals of successful and satisfying living set up by the national groups of the Parent-Teachers Association: 1. Self-realization; 2. Human Relationships; 3. Civic Responsibility; and 4. Economic Efficiency. The fact that high school teaching is in the process of being reconstructed and that these goals form the basis for the reorganization should make this text attractive to educators everywhere.

Under the first objective, Self-realization, are grouped the first six chapters. They cover: the basic elements of speech, learning to speak, the importance of satisfactory speech, and the qualities of good speech. The general principles of visible action and voice are explained. Meaning and the problem of vocal

interestingness are discussed helpfully. Next, the book deals with letters and sounds, dialects, and the elements of spoken language. Creative listening is described as active and selective.

Here it is important to emphasize the fact that this text is scientifically sound. Speech is no longer taught from vague, general, subjective hunches. The material is based on what has been accomplished in modern speech laboratories. For example, in the chapter on language and meaning, the differences between oral and written language, the characteristics they have in common, and the universal qualities of great style are treated in the light of the scientific findings in Ph.D. theses by Borchers, Krefting, Sterrett, and Kauny.

Under the second objective of Human Relationships are the following chapters: Keys to the Mind, Conversation, Classroom Speaking, Storytelling, Interpretative Reading, Dramatics, and Public Speech. In these chapters one easily recognizes the highly functional quality of this text. It follows boys and girls in the things they do during the high school years in and out of the classroom and after high school, to college, or to a life vocation. The point of view is that a child is living and needing speech for life during the years from twelve to eighteen—rather than learning speech solely to prepare him for some future needs.

The arrangement of chapters throughout is inductive and psychological rather than deductive and logical, as witness the order of the topics under Civic Responsibility: Discussion, Debating, Parliamentary Procedure, and Radio Speaking. Obviously this is the psychological place for radio speaking.

Under the fourth goal, Economic Efficiency, are discussions on Telephoning, Interviews and Conferences, Dictating Letters, Buying and Selling, and How to Make and Receive Complaints.

The authors have been successful in their effort to make the book interesting. There are many pages of intriguing exercises. The discussion is direct and stimulating, and the book is profusely illustrated with half-tones and line drawings. It will appeal to both teacher and student and it will accomplish its objectives in substantial and authoritative fashion.

ANGELA GREBEL
East Senior High School
Madison, Wisconsin

GUIDES TO SPEECH TRAINING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, by Carrie Rasmussen, Chairman of the elementary committee of the N.A.T.S. Boston; The Expression Company; 1943. 135 pp. \$2.00.

Guides to Speech Training in the Elementary School is a report of the elementary committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech published in 1943 with Carrie Rasmussen, Public Schools, Madison, Wisconsin, as chairman. A foreword by Dr. Robert West, then president of the national association, stresses that the period of childhood is a time when we can do profitably a great deal of directing and correcting of speech and that at last, in the training of the young child, speech teachers are getting at basic fundamentals.

The report is divided into five parts: Speech Education, Speech Improve-

ment, Speech Arts Improvements, 'Speech Correction, and the Organization of a City and State Program of Elementary Speech Education.

Part One, Speech Education, is well started with an article entitled *This Talking World* by Miss Rasmussen, which reminds us that we are in a speaking age; that ninety-five per cent of our language needs are oral; that with the radio, telephone, cinema—with the very existence of our democratic government functions depending so largely, so completely on the spoken word—everyone *must* be speech-minded. Since all teachers are speech teachers, this guide is intended to aid them in gaining a working philosophy and abundant material.

Elvena Miller, Public Schools, Seattle, Washington, then discusses specifically what speech education is, commenting that too often the term *speech* connotes only a jargon of linguistic aspects such as voice modulation and articulation, whereas in reality it is much more than that: it is an expression of the whole individual intellectually, emotionally, and socially, as well as physically.

Dr. Magdalene Kramer of Teachers College, Columbia University, emphasizes that means of expression, transmission of thought, communication, are basic to personal development, mentioning the effect of the influence of adult speech, of which models for imitation are so poor today. She discusses speech as basic to educational development. Speech is the means by which the individual is able to adjust to group life. It is a skill basic to reading and spelling. She quotes several reading specialists and psychologists who reiterate that speech defects and reading deficiencies are closely associated.

In speaking of the school program Dr. Kramer says that attention should first be given to the speech of parents and teachers. There must be an effort through P.T.A. and adult education programs to make these groups aware of their needs.

In every classroom of the kindergarten, primary, and elementary school, all forms of speech activities are used. Hence each teacher should consider:

1. The close relation between thinking and speaking
2. The value of audibility, intelligibility and pleasant voice quality
3. The socializing aspect of speech
4. The needs for various techniques

Part Two starts with a test for speech improvement that Miss Rasmussen has formulated. It should be especially helpful in showing teachers concretely of what to be mindful.

In this division there is a section on *Speech and Thinking* by W. W. Parker, President of the State Teachers College at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, and an article on *Bodily Action—Part Speech* by Harley Smith, University of Chicago. Mr. Smith outlines ways of improving a child's bodily movement through rhythm, pantomime, and creative dramatics. He suggests in detail activities to correlate with bodily action for creative speech. There is really practical help here in lists of games for corrective speech.

Rita Christe of Evanston, Illinois, has a section on voice improvement. She suggests, in outline, a plan of procedure in teaching which includes games of good English usage. As do the other contributors Miss Christe stresses the

creative approach, using children's interests, dramatic instincts, and a variety of material and procedure.

Ila H. Swanson of East Waterloo, Iowa, discusses *How to Develop Better Speech Through All Subjects*. She brings in the essentials of preparing for talks, room programs, discussions, of becoming good listeners as well as speakers.

Part Three contains a splendid overview of oral reading, storytelling, poetry interpretations, creative dramatics, talks, club meetings, puppetry, assemblies, and use of radio in the classroom. There is excellent help here for the classroom teacher concerning the approach to using these activities and materials and means of evaluating the experiences.

Part Four deals with psychology of speech development. There is a speech check sheet made by Charlotte Wells formerly of Mt. Holyoke College, a suggestion for organization of speech correction for the small school, preliminary exercises for the speech lesson, elementary articulation drills, and a description (for the purpose of helping the teacher to understand and to do what she can to help) of the lisps, nasality and cleft palate deformities.

The last part, *The Organization of a City and State Program of Elementary Speech Education*, is prepared by Raymond E. Krogell, formerly Supervisor of Speech in Missouri. The material is based primarily on the experience in a state having such a program in action. It considers care of the speech needs of the three groups of children: those of inferior, normal, and superior speech development.

At the close of each section of the book are valuable bibliographies.

MARGARET PARRET
Emerson School, Madison, Wis.

PLAY REVIEWS

ROBERT B. CAPEL

DARK WIND, Evelyn Neuenburg, Ivan Bloom Hardin Co., copyright 1940. Royalty \$5.00. Drama in one act. 1 man, 3 women. 1 interior. College*, High School*.

This play was first produced December 1, 1939, at the Stratford Playhouse, Pasadena, California. It immediately strikes a morbid overtone which it maintains throughout in spite of a rather feeble attempt to rise to a wholesome outlook in the end. It is a glimpse of emotional outbursts of three nurses aboard a freighter in mined waters during war.

The interior set of a pneumonia ward should not be too difficult. The props will necessitate cooperation in borrowing from a doctor or clinic as such items as hypodermic needle, clinical thermometer, hospital charts, etc., are desirable for effectiveness. Lighting can be handled easily with spots. Costuming entails procurement of nurse uniforms. Sound effects of heavy wind and tossing sea are an integral part of the play. Casting should not be too difficult although the play opens at a high dramatic pitch and becomes more intense. It could be played easily with four women characters.

ROBERT B. CAPEL

WOMAN'S PAGE (UNCENSORED). Anna Mae Fisher, Ivan Bloom Hardin Company, copyright 1941. Royalty: purchase of cast copies. A comedy in one act. 9 women. 1 interior. College **, High School**.

This light comedy, portraying the whimsies and vanities of the female sex through the characters of employees of a woman's page in a newspaper, moves rapidly along to a climax that would be a bit forced were the general tone of the play less frivolous. It holds together fairly well and should produce laughs.

The play offers no difficult production problems. Played against a background of an editorial room in the process of redecoration, some latitude in the choice of the one interior set may be taken. Costumes are modern and there are no lighting problems. The props are easily obtained anywhere and the few sound effects are easily produced.

If you are looking for a longer-than-usual one act comedy with a large number of female parts, this play should fill your needs.

WILLIAM F. GALLOWAY

SHE'S A NEAT JOB, Richard F. Sturm. Ivan Bloom Hardin Company, copyright 1945. Royalty \$5.00. A comedy in one act. 7 men, 5 women. 1 interior. College**, High School**.

This play was originally entitled "All Aboard" and was the first prize winner in the third naval district one act play contest. It was one of the five plays sharing the \$1,000 prize money given by John Golden. The winning plays were

selected from among 220 scripts submitted by enlisted personnel of the marine corps, the navy and the coast guard.

The set is the interior of a car of a railroad train. The staging can be elaborate or simple as desired. The lighting presents no difficult problems. Two of the women's roles could be changed easily to men's roles. Sound effects include the sound of the train running. The costumes of the women are modern street costumes. Six of the men wear naval uniforms, the seventh wears the uniform of the train conductor. Casting the play should not be difficult.

The plot of the play has little development. There is a moderate amount of suspense. The play should be produced soon if it is to be popular with an audience; it is unquestionably dated in its appeal.

ROBERT B. CAPEL

ANGEL UNAWARES. Felicia Metcalfe. Ivan Bloom Hardin Company, copyright 1936. Royalty \$10. A comedy in three acts. 5 men, 5 women. 1 interior. College**, High School***.

The set for this play would be easy, the casting would not be difficult and the lighting presents no difficult problems. Sound effects include the squawking of a chicken. Costumes are modern.

Suspense in the play is reasonably well maintained. The copyright is ten years ago, but the play is not dated in plot or development. The characters are well drawn and present good comedy. As a play in the low royalty field, this play is well worth considering by a director, especially on the high school level.

ROBERT B. CAPEL

THE TANGLED YARN. Dagmar Vola. Ivan Bloom Hardin Company, copyright 1938. Royalty \$10. A comedy in three acts. 5 men, 7 women. 1 interior. College*, High School**.

This play has an easy set. The costumes are practically all modern; one old lady is dressed to be out of date. Sound effects include a telephone ringing. Casting in high school should not be difficult.

High schools should find this play fairly satisfactory for a low royalty play. The suspense is held reasonably well; the ending is somewhat forced.

ROBERT B. CAPEL



